Remarks / Arguments:

Claims 1-23 are pending. Claims 1, 4, 5, 7, 10, 12, 14, 17, and 23 have been amended.

Regarding independent claim 1, independent claim 1 has been amended regarding the video capturing volume from "with respect to" to "within" in the preamble, in the second step and in the fourth step.

The Examiner rejects independent claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. 102 (b) as being anticipated by U.S. Pat. 5,786,846 by Hiroaki ("the Hiroaki patent"). The Examiner states that the third step of independent claim 1 "generating an abstract representation of the person" of the present invention is anticipated by the Hiroaki patent (column 11, lines 1-15). The Applicants respectfully disagree. The Hiroaki patent states usage of "**texts** for alarming the user" (column 11, line 6), "codes or pictures for alarming such as arrow or the like and illustrations or pictures indicating the deviation" (column 11, lines 9-11), and "the video image something irrelevant to the content of the conversation" (column 11, lines 11-12). None of the images disclosed in the Hiroaki patent is generated based upon the image of the user ("the person"). Therefore, the images disclosed in the Hiroaki patent are not "an abstraction of the person." Therefore, the Hiroaki patent does not disclose or suggest "generating an abstraction of the person."

The Examiner also states that the fourth step of independent claim 1, now amended as, "displaying the abstract representation to the person such that the abstract representation indicates the location of the person within the video capturing volume of the camera" of the present invention is anticipated by the Hiroaki patent (column 10, lines 52-64). The Applicants respectfully disagree. The Hiroaki patent states (column 10, lines 51-59):

> If the local user is within the shoot range of the camera, [] the video synthesis selection section 301 sends the remote user's video image as it is which has been received by the video communication section []. If the local user is out of the shoot range, the video synthesizing selection section 310 sends the notification video [].

The Hiroaki patent discloses displaying an image such as text, an arrow, or an irrelevant image, specifically to "notify the local user of his/her deviation from the shooting range" (column

11, lines 14-15), and "if the local user is out of the shoot range" (column 10, line 57). Further, the image displayed as disclosed in the Hiroaki patent is not "the abstract representation" disclosed by the present invention. Still further, amended independent claim 1 includes in the fourth step the limitations of "the abstract representation indicates the location of the person within the video capturing volume of the camera." The Hiroaki patent fails to disclose generating an abstraction, and also fails to disclose displaying the abstraction when the user is within the video capturing volume. Therefore, amended independent claim 1 is distinguishable from the Hiroaki patent, and is patentable over the Hiroaki patent.

Regarding dependent claims 2 and 3, because dependent claims 2 and 3 depend from, and include all the limitations of, amended independent claim 1, dependent claims 2 and 3 are patentable over the Hiroaki patent.

Regarding dependent claim 4, dependent claim 4 has been amended regarding the video capturing volume from "with respect to" to "within." Because amended dependent claim 4 depends from, and includes all the limitations of, amended independent claim 1 and dependent claim 3, amended dependent claim 4 is patentable over the Hiroaki patent.

Regarding dependent claim 5, dependent claim 5 has been amended regarding the video capturing volume from "with respect to" to "within." The Examiner rejects dependent claim 5 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Hiroaki patent in view of Wilensky, US 2002/0118875 ("the Wilensky publication"). Because amended dependent claim 5 depends from, and includes all the limitations of, amended independent claim 1, amended dependent claim 5 is patentable over the Hiroaki patent in view of the Wilensky publication.

Regarding dependent claim 6, because dependent claim 6 depends from, and includes all the limitations of, amended independent claim 1, dependent claim 6 is patentable over the Hiroaki patent.

Regarding dependent claim 7, dependent claim 7 has been amended regarding the video capturing volume from "with respect to" to "within." Because amended dependent claim 7

depends from, and includes all the limitations of, amended independent claim 1, amended dependent claim 7 is patentable over the Hiroaki patent.

Regarding dependent claims 8 and 9, because dependent claims 8 and 9 depend from, and include all the limitations of, amended independent claim 1 and amended dependent claim 7, dependent claims 8 and 9 are patentable over the Hiroaki patent.

Regarding independent claim 10, independent claim 10 has been amended regarding the video capturing volume from "with respect to" to "within" in the preamble.

The Examiner rejects independent claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. 102 (b) as being anticipated by the Hiroaki patent, and states that the third step of independent claim 10 "generating an abstract representation of the user" of the present invention is anticipated by the Hiroaki patent (column 11, lines 1-15). The Applicants respectfully disagree. The Hiroaki patent states usage of "**texts** for alarming the user" (column 11, line 6), "codes or pictures for alarming such as arrow or the like and illustrations or pictures indicating the deviation" (column 11, lines 9-11), and "the video image something irrelevant to the content of the conversation" (column 11, lines 11-12). None of the images disclosed in the Hiroaki patent is generated based upon the image of the user. Therefore, the images disclosed in the Hiroaki patent are not "an abstraction of the user." Therefore, the Hiroaki patent does not disclose or suggest "generating an abstraction of the user."

The Examiner also states that the fourth step of independent claim 10 "displaying the abstract representation to the user on a display of the two-way communication device, such that the abstract representation indicates the location of the user within the video capturing volume of the camera" of the present invention is anticipated by the Hiroaki patent (column 10, lines 52-64). The Applicants respectfully disagree. The Hiroaki patent states (column 10, lines 51-59):

> If the local user is within the shoot range of the camera, [] the video synthesis selection section 301 sends the remote user's video image as it is which has been received by the video communication section []. If the local user is out of the shoot range, the video synthesizing selection section 310 sends the notification video [].

The Hiroaki patent discloses displaying an image such as text, an arrow, or an irrelevant image, specifically to "notify the local user of his/her deviation from the shooting range" (column 11, lines 14-15), and "if the local user is out of the shoot range" (column 10, line 57). Further, the image displayed as disclosed in the Hiroaki patent is not "the abstract representation" disclosed by the present invention. Still further, amended independent claim 10 includes in the fourth step the limitations of "the abstract representation indicates the location of the user within the video capturing volume of the camera." The Hiroaki patent fails to disclose generating an abstraction, and also fails to disclose displaying the abstraction when the user is within the video capturing volume. Therefore, amended independent claim 10 is distinguishable from the Hiroaki patent, and is patentable over the Hiroaki patent.

Regarding dependent claim 11, the Examiner rejects dependent claim 11 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Hiroaki patent. Because dependent claim 11 depends from, and includes all the limitations of, amended independent claim 10, dependent claim 11 is patentable over the Hiroaki patent.

Regarding independent claim 12, independent claim 12 has been amended regarding the video capturing volume from "with respect to" to "within" in the first element and in the third element.

The Examiner rejects independent claim 12 under 35 U.S.C. 102 (b) as being anticipated by the Hiroaki patent, and states that the second element of independent claim 12 "an abstract representation generator for generating an abstract representation of the person" of the present invention is anticipated by the Hiroaki patent (FIG. 3, element 302). The Applicants respectfully disagree. The Hiroaki patent specifically states that "A notification video generation section 302 generates the video indicating that the local user is out of the shoot range and sends the generated notification video 390 to a video synthesis selection section 301." The Hiroaki patent further discloses the "video indicating that the local user is out of the shoot range" as "**texts** for alarming the user" (column 11, line 6), "codes or pictures for alarming such as arrow or the like and illustrations or pictures indicating the deviation" (column 11, lines 9-11), and "the video image something irrelevant to the content of the conversation" (column 11, lines 11-12). None of the images disclosed in the Hiroaki patent is generated based upon the image of the person.

Therefore, the images disclosed in the Hiroaki patent are not "an abstraction of the person." Therefore, the Hiroaki patent does not disclose or suggest "an abstract representation generator for generating an abstraction of the person."

The Examiner also states that the third element of independent claim 12, now amended, "a video processor, operably coupled to the location determiner and the abstract representation generator, for positioning the abstract representation in an image to be displayed to the person such that the abstract representation indicates the location of the person within the video capturing volume of the camera" of the present invention is anticipated by the Hiroaki patent (column 10, lines 57-60). The Applicants respectfully disagree. As the Examiner has correctly stated the Hiroaki patent discloses displaying an image to show that the user is out of range. The video processor of the present invention provides: "the abstract representation indicates the location of the person within the video capturing volume of the camera," which clearly implies that the person is not out of range of the camera when the abstract representation is displayed. The Hiroaki patent discloses displaying an image such as text, an arrow, or an irrelevant image, specifically to "notify the local user of his/her deviation from the shooting range" (column 11, lines 14-15), and "if the local user is out of the shoot range" (column 10, line 57). Further, the image displayed as disclosed in the Hiroaki patent is not "the abstract representation" disclosed by the present invention.

The Hiroaki patent fails to disclose an abstract representation generator, and also fails to disclose displaying the abstraction when the user is within the video capturing volume. Therefore, amended independent claim 12 is distinguishable from the Hiroaki patent, and is patentable over the Hiroaki patent.

Regarding dependent claim 13, because dependent claim 13 depends from, and includes all the limitations of, amended independent claim 12, dependent claim 13 is patentable over the Hiroaki patent.

Regarding dependent claim 14, the Examiner rejects dependent claim 14 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Hiroaki patent. Dependent claim 14 has been amended regarding the video capturing volume from "with respect to" to "within." Because amended

dependent claim 14 depends from, and includes all the limitations of, amended independent claim 12, amended dependent claim 14 is patentable over the Hiroaki patent.

Regarding dependent claims 15 and 16, because dependent claims 15 and 16 depend from, and include all the limitations of, amended independent claim 12, dependent claims 15 and 16 are patentable over the Hiroaki patent.

Regarding dependent claim 17, dependent claim 17 has been amended regarding the relative location change from "with respect to" to "within." Because amended dependent claim 17 depends from, and includes all the limitations of, amended independent claim 12, amended dependent claim 17 is patentable over the Hiroaki patent.

Regarding dependent claim 18, because dependent claim 18 depends from, and includes all the limitations of, amended independent claim 12 and amended dependent claim 17, dependent claim 18 is patentable over the Hiroaki patent.

Regarding dependent claim 19, because dependent claims 19 depends from, and includes all the limitations of, amended independent claim 12, dependent claim 19 is patentable over the Hiroaki patent.

Regarding dependent claims 20 and 21, the Examiner rejects dependent claims 20 and 21 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Hiroaki patent in view of Hindus, et al. US 6,282,206 ("the Hindus patent). Because dependent claims 20 and 21 depend from, and include all the limitations of, amended independent claim 12, dependent claims 20 and 21 are patentable over the Hiroaki patent in view of the Hindu patent.

Regarding dependent claim 22, because dependent claims 22 depends from, and includes all the limitations of, amended independent claim 12, dependent claim 22 is patentable over the Hiroaki patent.

Regarding independent claim 23, independent claim 23 has been amended regarding the video capturing volume from "with respect to" to "within" in the fifth element.

The Examiner rejects independent claim 23 under 35 U.S.C. 102 (b) as being anticipated by the Hiroaki patent, and states that the third element of independent claim 23 "an abstract representation generator for generating an abstract representation of the user" of the present invention is anticipated by the Hiroaki patent. The Applicants respectfully disagree. The Examiner refers to element 302 of FIG. 6 as representing the third element of the present invention, however, there is no element 302 in FIG. 6. The Applicants assume that the Examiner meant to refer to element 302 of FIG. 3. The Hiroaki patent specifically states that "A notification video generation section 302 generates the video indicating that the local user is out of the shoot range and sends the generated notification video 390 to a video synthesis selection section 301." The Hiroaki patent further discloses the "video indicating that the local user is out of the shoot range" as "**texts** for alarming the user" (column 11, line 6), "codes or pictures for alarming such as arrow or the like and illustrations or pictures indicating the deviation" (column 11, lines 9-11), and "the video image something irrelevant to the content of the conversation" (column 11, lines 11-12). None of the images disclosed in the Hiroaki patent is generated based upon the image of the person. Therefore, the images disclosed in the Hiroaki patent are not "an abstraction of the person." Therefore, the Hiroaki patent does not disclose or suggest "an abstract representation generator for generating an abstraction of the person."

The Examiner also states that the fifth element of independent claim 23, now amended, "a video processor, operably coupled to the location determiner and the abstract representation generator, for arraging the abstract representation and the image received from the second tw0-way communication device together in a composite image to be displayed to the user such that the abstract representation indicates the location of the user within the video capturing volume of the camera" of the present invention is anticipated by the Hiroaki patent. The Applicants respectfully disagree. The Examiner refers to element 301 of FIG. 6 as representing the fifth element of the present invention, however, there is no element 301 in FIG. 6. The Applicants assume that the Examiner meant to refer to element 301 of FIG. 3. As the Examiner has correctly stated the Hiroaki patent discloses displaying an image to show that the user is out of range. The video processor of the present invention provides: "the abstract representation indicates the location of the user within the video capturing volume of the camera," which clearly

implies that the user is not out of range of the camera when the abstract representation is displayed. The Hiroaki patent discloses displaying an image such as text, an arrow, or an irrelevant image, specifically to "notify the local user of his/her deviation from the shooting range" (column 11, lines 14-15), and "if the local user is out of the shoot range" (column 10, line 57). Further, the image displayed as disclosed in the Hiroaki patent is not "the abstract representation" disclosed by the present invention.

The Hiroaki patent fails to disclose an abstract representation generator, and also fails to disclose displaying the abstraction when the user is within the video capturing volume. Therefore, amended independent claim 23 is distinguishable from the Hiroaki patent, and is patentable over the Hiroaki patent.

In view of the discussion above, the Claims of the present application are in condition for allowance. Kindly withdraw any rejections and objections and allow this application to issue as a United States Patent without further delay.

Respectfully submitted,
Klapman, et al.

Shigeharu Furukawa

MOTOROLA, INC.
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DEPT. (SF)
600 NORTH U.S. HIGHWAY 45, AS437
LIBERTYVILLE, ILLINOIS 60048

Shigeharu Furukawa August 24, 2004
REG. NO. 50,481
TELEPHONE NO. (847) 523-1987
FACSIMILE NO. (847) 523-2350